

GRAUSTARK

#149

1966AA, 1967U, 1967V

20 January 1968

1966AA

"Winter 1914"

TRUCE RUMORS CONTINUE; SO DOES MOBILIZATION

GERMANY (Latimer): Builds A Ber, A Kie.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Walker): Builds A Vie, A Bud.

Each player now has 16 units on the board. Since no draw has as yet been agreed upon, the game will continue. The deadline for "Spring 1915" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 3 FEBRUARY 1968. However, the Gamesmaster will conduct this game by carbon copy, sending out adjudicated moves as soon as both players submit them. All moves which have been played by the publication date of GRAUSTARK #150 will be reported in that issue.

VIENNA (26 December 1914): The former capital of Austria today rang with celebration when, as the climax of this year's Yule Orgy, the Kaiser of Germany and the Empress of Balkania were wed. Her Imperial Majesty, the beauteous Lucrezia (Her Holiness Pope Joan II & Her Serene Majesty Theodosia II, Empress of Rome & of the East) was never more radiant as she entered the imposing Cathedral of St. Rodewix the Wonderful, recently built on the site of the Chapel of St. Peericelli the Unworthy, which was torn down because it was so small and shabby and had a door five times too large for its size. His Imperial Majesty Kaiser Wilhelm III arrived in a cedar-wood coach, trimmed with platinum and cloth-of-gold, wearing the Iron Crown of Charlemagne as a sign of His primacy over the West. The two were wed in ceremonies presided over by His Magnificence, Alexander Cardinal Borghese, Her Holiness' father, formerly Pope Innocent XIV and now Supreme All-Powerful Archarchbishop of the Western Hemisphere. Part of the Revised Standard Liturgy involved the use of a boy of virgins and castrich plumes (imported from the Balkanian province of Sevastopol). The reception, held in Schönbrunn Palace, was attended by dignitaries from all over Europe, and included an appearance by Infant Prince James, in itty-bitty gold chains. It was suggested that it might be nice to put put his little eyes with teeny-weeny red-hot irons, but he was finally thrown to the Sevastopolitan Virgins, who

1967V

"Spring 1906"

WESTERN ALLIES TAKE KIEL;
GERMAN ARMY WIPED OUT

ENGLAND (Lebling): F Norwegian Sea-Norway;
F Bar S F Norwegian Sea-Norway; F Hel-
Den; F Hol S FRENCH A Ruh-Kie.

FRANCE (Prosnitz): A Mun-Ber; A Ruh-Kie;
A Bur-Ruh; A Mar-Pie; F Bre-Mid; F Tyr
S ITALIAN F Nap; F Tun-Ion; F North Sea
S ENGLISH F Norwegian Sea-Norway.

GERMANY (M. Thomson): A Kie-Ruh; F Den-
Kie; F Per S F Den-Kie; A Sil-Mun; A
Norway holds; A Swe S A Norway.

ITALY (Griffin): A Rom-Apu; F Nap S A
Rom-Apu.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (H. Anderson): A Ukr-Mes;
A Boh & A Tyr S GERMAN A Sil-Mun; A Ven
S TURKISH A Apu-Rom; A Pie-Tus; F Alb-
Tri.

TURKEY (S. Heap): A St.P S GERMAN A Nor-
way; F Aeg-Ion; F Bas & F Gre S F Aeg-
Ion; F Ion-Tyr; F Apu-Rom; F Adr-Apu.

Underlined moves are not possible. The German army in Kiel is annihilated, and the French army in Munich retreats to Burgundy. The deadline for "Fall 1906" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 3 FEBRUARY 1968.

tickled him to death. The chicken Sultan of Turkey was also thrown to the virgins, and he was tickled pink. After a while, he was forgiven his sins and given a nice little villa in Cyprus to live in, along with the Virgins. Or, more precisely, Were-gins. Karl Turnoff, having been released from prison, was sent to St. Rozhdestvensky Monastery, where Fra. Lorenzo Peericelli has taken him under his protection and guidance. How nice... During the nuptial festivities, Her Majesty mixed many of her favorite cocktails, which were naturally refused by members of the Papal

(continued on p. 3)

REGISTRATION OPENS FOR NEW POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMES IN GRAUSTARK

Despite numerous requests, your Gamesmaster was reluctant to open new games because we will be out of town for at least two months this summer. However, John McCallum has offered to take over these games, as well as 1967U and 1967V, temporarily while we're gone. (See his letter on p. 5.) So, now that the possibility of a hiatus in play has been avoided, two new games will be opened in GRAUSTARK.

The entry fee remains \$3.50. (Canadians please remit using a postal money order payable in U. S. dollars.) Your entry fee will bring you all issues of GRAUSTARK up to the conclusion of the game, even if you are eliminated.

These games will follow the postal Diplomacy rules published in GRAUSTARK #100. Back issues of #100 are no longer available, but many of the most commonly disputed points are discussed in #112, which is still available at the back issue price of 10¢. GRAUSTARK does not use Koning's rule, but Galhamer's. Diplomacy rulebooks are available at \$1.00 each.

The first fourteen entries to come in, with payment, will be accepted for these two games. The Gamesmaster will divide these entries between the two games as he sees fit, and will assign countries by lot. The next four entries to arrive will be stand-bys, unless these entrants specify that they don't want to be. In that case they, as well as entrants who come in later, will be given a choice between a refund and applying the money to a subscription. Stand-bys will get GRAUSTARK under the same conditions as the regular players do, and the first stand-by has to submit moves if one of the players misses a move.

Anyone already subscribing to GRAUSTARK, who joins one of the new games, will resume his subscription when the game is over. He will then be entitled to as many additional issues of GRAUSTARK as are presently left on his subscription.

Players will be apportioned among the two games so that as few as possible from a given geographical area will be in the same game. However, if 7 entries from New York City come in, they may all be entered in one game, which can be expedited by the geographical proximity of the players.

Assignments of countries will go out as soon as the games are filled.

Diplomacy fans without the time to participate in these new games may be interested in following them from the beginning in GRAUSTARK. Subscription rates for non-players are 10 issues for \$1.00.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF BEAUCOUILLON - XV

Cardinal d'Avino's assessment of the effects of the Reformation on Beaucouillon proved to be correct. This was dramatically demonstrated in 1587, during a masked ball at the Spanish embassy to celebrate the approaching conquest of England. Two masked men recognized each other across the basset table as King Henri of France and King Henri of Navarre, rival Catholic and Protestant claimants to the French throne.

"Bon soir, you effete, idolatrous, limp-wristed Papist!" Henri of Navarre greeted him.

"Bon soir, you heretical, sweat-reeking, skirt-chasing altar-thief!" Henri of France responded.

Fortunately, Grand Duke Roger IV was also playing at that table. At this crucial moment he cried, "Soissant-et-le-va!" The general amazement at this play - which bucks odds of better than 200,000 to 1 - shocked both kings out of their incipient struggle, and preserved the peace of the Grand Duchy.

The Grand Duke lost his bet, and with it 50,000 ducats, to the banker, who was Count Sylvestro Schoszky, secretary to the Spanish Ambassador. Count Schoszky visited the roulette table in the Grand Ducal Bourse the next day and lost the entire amount back, plus an additional 30,000 ducats. To pay his debts he was forced to sign over his extensive Hungarian estates to the Grand Duke. However, the benefit to the Grand Duchy was minimal, as these estates had been under Turkish occupation for three generations.

*

John Koning, Apt. 1, 2008 Sherman, Evanston, Ill. 60201, will begin a new Diplomacy 'zine in April. It will be called Valhalla, and is backed by Chris Wagner's S&T.

GERMANS PULL BACK FROM RUSSIAN ATTACK

In adjudicating the "Fall 1906" moves, the Gamesmaster neglected to note that the German move A St.P-Norway and the Russian move F Norwegian-Sea-Norway stood each other off. Thus, neither the Russian fleet in the Norwegian Sea nor the Italian fleet in the North Atlantic moves. All players were informed of this correction. Following "Fall 1906" moves, Germany retreated A St.P-Liv.

ITALY (Clark): Builds F Nap, A Rom.

TURKEY (Beshara): Builds F Smy, F Con.

RUSSIA (G. Heap): Removes F Norwegian Sea.

The deadline for "Spring 1907" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 3 FEBRUARY 1968.

1966AA (continued from p. 1)

Curia, and Balkanian Government, and other people who know Her. The Kaiser, however, drank several and pronounced them excellent. Hmm. Lucrezia is smiling very broadly, now. You don't suppose....?

THE ADVENTURES OF SECRET AGENT O-O-HATE

Chapter XLII

Secret Agent O-O-Hate and his boy assistant, Burner, looked about the ancient Roman arena in which a malfunction of Dr. Pourguerre's matter transmitter had landed them. In a canopied box, a fat man shouted something.

"It's Latin, O-O-Hate," Burner said. "I learned it at the Blessed Balthasar Gerard Seminary in my identity as Victor Charlie Burner, mild-mannered divinity student."

"What did he say?" O-O-Hate asked.

Burner's answer was unnecessary. A huge iron gate opened, and out bounded a gigantic lion.

"Holy Martyrdom!" Burner exclaimed. "And all we wanted to do was come to Rome and get that peacenik Pope to see the error of his ways. Now how can we fight the International Pacifist Conspiracy?"

"Cheer up, Burner!" O-O-Hate encouraged him, as the lion got closer. "We come armed with all the marvels of modern technology. Give me that little capsule from Dow Chemical in your utility belt."

Burner handed O-O-Hate the capsule. The secret agent opened it, and flung it at the gaping jaws of the lion. Instantly the beast's teeth became enmeshed in a tangle of Saranwrap.

"No, the other capsule from Dow!" O-O-Hate shouted. But the napalm was unnecessary. The lion rolled on his back, and vainly clawed at the sheets of plastic which were entangling his jaws. Amused by this trickery, the crowd roared its approval. Even the Emperor's petulant face broke into a smile, and he summoned the Americans to him. A Pretorian guard went out to escort them.

The guardsman said something in Latin, then repeated it in Greek. O-O-Hate could understand Greek, since he had helped to overthrow three governments in that country in the ceaseless struggle against the sinister forces of World Peace.

"Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus wants to see youse guys!" the guard said.

"This is really the Emperor Nero?" O-O-Hate asked.

"Yeah - Pater Patriae, Divus Augustus, Princeps, Solus Consul, Matris Irrumator, and all the rest of it."

The guardsman escorted them before the Imperial Box. Nero, who sat between two very attractive women, leaned over as far as his bulk permitted.

"Who are you barbarians?" he asked.

"I am Secret Agent O-O-Hate, and this is my assistant, Burner," O-O-Hate replied. "We fight against the decadent forces of peace."

"Against peace, eh?" Nero growled. "Throw them into the dungeons!"

((Why is Nero a pacifist? Read the next installment in GRAUSTARK #150.))

WAR GAMES AND THE GAME OF WAR

III. The Symbol and the Reality

"There is nothing wrong in chess; it has to do with war." - Khalif Omar (d. 644)

A certain school of psychology apparently is governed by the rule that nobody does anything for the reasons that he believes to be valid. This school of thought comes to particularly ludicrous conclusions when it attempts to analyze games and hobbies. Its practitioners seem unwilling to believe that anyone does anything for the sheer enjoyment of it, or plays games for the intellectual challenge or the joy of competition. Thus, stamp collectors are engaged in a vicarious conquest of the world by enclosing its stamps in their albums, auto racers are proving their masculinity with internal-combustion phalloi, and what Freudians make out of speleology I'll leave to your own imaginations.

And, of course, the chessplayer or war gamer cannot be left in peace over his game board. Reuben Fine, in his famous article on the psychology of chess players, points out that a boy first learns chess from his father, and thus engages in Oedipal competition. The powerful queen and the weak, dependent king are also exploited to find Freudian imagery, and much is made out of the fact that the psychotic Alyokhin first learned chess from his mother rather than from his father.

To the best of my knowledge, war games have escaped, except from the misguided concern of the opponents of war toys. These people are quite correct in protesting the soldier-dolls, or such openly propagandistic board games as "Victory Over Communism" and "Conflict". But it would be fatuous to argue that the devotee of "Tactics II" or "Gettysburg" or "Diplomacy" would really be happier if he had millions of real soldiers at his disposal in an actual war.

The concern of these psychologists would be better directed towards the men who deal with real soldiers (and civilians) as if they were playing a game.

But, if we war gamers are not sublimated generals, neither are we completely divorced from the world in which real wars occur. Diplomacy, for example, is based on World War I - that squalid, futile, and least necessary of modern wars. Stripped of all rhetoric, that war was an attempt by Germany to replace Great Britain as the world's leading commercial power. As usual in such cases, a third party - here, the United States of America - walked off with that dubious honor.

Since war games are rooted in the real world, it cannot be kept out of war game journals. Several of the causes of World War I (or of the Napoleonic Wars, or World War II) are still operative today; in fact, the Vietnam War already has its own war game, published by Gamescience. War gamers cannot play one of these games, and at the same time ignore the operation of these factors in the world today. In fact, many war games are advertised as making it possible for players to understand better the world conditions and conflicts of our own time.

Thus, by one means or another, the "cold war" and the war in Vietnam (and Yemen, Sinai, etc., etc.) are already in the war game bulletins. Either they come in covertly, as in the Diplomacy press releases which are actually commentary on Vietnam, or they come in openly, in the form of comments on war and comparisons with war games in letter columns, articles, editorials, or even poems.

There was a comparable situation in the early days of science-fiction fandom a third of a century ago. Originally, science-fiction fandom thought of itself as a science fandom (the so-called "Gernsback delusion") or as a literary society. But both science and literature must exist in the real world, and it is the society in which we live which determines to what ends science and technology are to be used, and what sort of literature is "undesirable" and must be censored. So s-f fan magazines quickly branched out into social and political commentary, and most of them remain such to this day. A similar development in war game bulletins is inevitable.

*

This concludes a 3-part series of editorials. The first two parts appeared in GRAUSTARKS #146 and #147, which are available, with other back issues, at 10¢ each.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

JOHN KONING, Apt. #1, 2008 Sherman, Evanston, Ill. 60201: I enclose a clipping mentioning Ron Daniels, local YUDG member who once played (or avoided play) in 1964C with you. You may also remember that this is the same Ron Daniels who served me as Rules Committee Chairman of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists at Youngstown University (when he was president of the NAACP chapter on campus), which tells you much about how conservative my chapter was. (But then, I told you that story once.)

((Yes, in GRAUSTARKS #75 & #78. The clipping tells of a debate on the "Black Power" issue, held on the Youngstown University campus between Daniels (pro) and one Ronald Pitman (con).))

You know, it's interesting - in sTab or Brobdingnag or any number of other magazines (though not in Big Bother, or Wild 'n' Woolly, or any number of others) I would have won 1965Q in "Fall 1921", when the French unit was destroyed, leaving the unit balance temporarily 17-16. It all depends on whether you interpret the builds as a separate "Winter" season (as I do) or whether you regard it as part of the "Fall" move as you do. Not that it matters. Had you played my way, Kuch could have arranged to take France's last center while leaving him a retreat. On the other hand, in Wild 'n' Woolly and elsewhere, where 18 centers are necessary for victory, even a spring annihilation would have made no difference.

...I am in a way relieved that 1965Q is over, but I wish mightily that I had won it. I have never played a game with so much interest, nor waited so eagerly for the latest moves...I acknowledge my respect for Terry Much, who played a much better game than his first few years' progress had led me to expect.

HARRY MANOGG, P. O. Box 769, Kankakee, Ill. 60901: Svetlana was one of the three fast scout cruisers ahead of Admiral Rozhdestvensky's fleet on May 27, 1904. They failed to find the Japanese. The Japanese scouts did not fail - and the battle of Tsushima ensued. On May 28 after the battle, the Svetlana was one of the ships hunted down by the Japanese and sunk when it refused to surrender. (Hailey and Lancelot, Clear for Action, 1964.)

This is

O At
P Great
E Intervals
R This
A Appears
T To
I Inflamm
O Optic
N Nerves

355

IVAN M. MUSICANT, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 330 W. 42nd St., New York, N. Y. 10036: As for your questions concerning the Russian light cruiser Svetlana, she was indeed sunk at the Battle of Tsu-Shima Straits. Svetlana was sunk after an action with four light cruisers, probably Chitose, Tekasago, Mitaka, and Akashi. She went down sometime during the early morning hours on 28 May 1904.

JOHN MCCALLUM, "A" Quarters, S. E. S., Ralston, Alberta: Re the Svetlana discussion. Shortly after you published Chris' original letter on the subject ((see GRAUSTARK #143)) I was in Edmonton for a few hours on business and thought I would see what I could find in the library there. They had a book on the naval aspects of the Russo-Japanese War, title and author I have forgotten. This book, though, listed all ships of both sides, in action, sunk, damaged, or what not, and the Svetlana was not included in the listings on the Russian side. They also have a fairly complete file of Jane's. Unfortunately mostly in the stacks and not the open shelves, and I didn't have time to go that far. However, the impression I gained from the issues of Jane's that I saw was that the Svetlana was re-named at about the time of the 1905 war and was used thereafter, under its new name, as a training ship in the Baltic.

The other item that I am wondering about is concerning your remark that you would be away for several months next summer, that 1967U and 1967V will be disrupted thereby, and that for that reason you don't want to begin new games now. Last year when Charles Wallis was in Norway I ran two of his games for him, in Brobdingnag, for the necessary move or two. I realize, of course, that more will be required in your case as your absence will be a good deal longer. However, if you want me to do so I'd run 1967U and 1967V (or new ones, for that matter) for the 2 months or so that you would be away. I think that the only differences in our playing procedures are that you don't use Koning's rule, and that for the victory criterion you count the Winter as part of the Fall move. If there are other differences you should let me know so that I could be using the same system as you do throughout. Apart from the rules, which are easily adjusted to conformity, there would be two unavoidable differences: 1. I don't publish quite as

promptly as you do. ". Propaganda would certainly not be handled as well, though I would publish what I received. Perhaps you could take it up with the players whether they would prefer to have the games progress with those two limitations, or whether they would prefer to have them suspended until your return.

((So I shall. See page 2.))

DR. KUCH, Apt. 204, 1910 15th St. North, Arlington, Va. 22201: About making illegal the advocacy of war - for a 'classical liberal' & pacifist/isolationist such as myself, reared on J. S. Mill & Thomas Jefferson, your Christmas message was alarming to say the least. Some immediate objections come to mind: (1) Freedom of speech & advocacy is a good safety valve, & more effective than repression in avoiding harmful actions, and (2) Spagbox revolution seldom results in action anyway, as the British have found out, and as the Russians have not - England is as safe from internal disorders as the USSR is, while allowing considerable freedom of advocacy. Even if freedom of speech were dangerous, each man must judge whether such freedom is of more importance than the optimum of social cohesion & lack of social friction (e. g., war). In the name of social cohesion virtually anything can be justified; but it is a matter of personal political conviction.

(Note: The above is in reference to your editorial only, and I specifically do not intend it to endorse our presence in Viet Nam ((sic)), or warlike actions generally.)

((This gets us into the whole question of whether incitement to a criminal act is itself a criminal act. It is well-known that planning a war is a criminal act; the United States accepted this position with the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and again as a member of the various War Crimes Tribunals after World War II. If two men plot together to kill a third, this plotting cannot be defended as an exercise of freedom of speech and association. Why, then, should the plotting of a few thousand men to kill many millions be excused on these grounds?))

I'm enclosing a copy of Commonweal with some things marked for you in red. Mostly anti-war statistics & clear argument, & also an article on Marcuse which is very perceptive. I don't generally send serious things for people to read, because they don't usually read them. But this issue ((22 December 1967)) should be right up your alley. An excellent magazine.

CHARLES TURNER, 24 Boyd Court, Pleasant Hill, Calif. 94523: After reading GRAUSTARK #146 I am almost to the point of flunking you beyond hope. However, you might try reading Book XIX of Augustine's City of God.

((Bygert isn't going to like it if you read books written by Africans!

((Seriously, this letter ties in very neatly with the article cited by Dr. Kuch in his letter. An editorial in Commonweal discusses the Roman Catholic theory of the "just war", which was first outlined by St. Augustine in the above-mentioned book. The editorial comments: "As they ((pacifists)) see it, the just war has been used historically only to justify one war after another. What hierarchy, the pacifists ask, ever condoned one of its own national wars? The question is a tough one. The American hierarchy, for example, held its tongue as Dresden was destroyed and Hiroshima and Nagasaki were nuclearized. The record of other national hierarchies is no better." The editorial goes on to give a brief history of the Catholic doctrine of the "just war", and proposes that the American invasion of Vietnam be examined in this light. The editorial contrasts two recent pronouncements by Catholics on the war: a Buckley editorial rejoicing over McNamara's fall, and a statement by the Claretian Fathers that "the war in Vietnam is immoral". Buckley, in a Commonweal column asks that control of the war be turned totally over to the military, while the Claretian Fathers in U. S. Catholic cite the specific features of the Vietnam war which have caused them to condemn it. Commonweal praises them for demonstrating "once more that the just war theory, properly used, is not a corrupt tool of the just warriors but can be a useful, indeed essential, instrument for moral judgments on our nation's or any nation's conduct of military affairs.))

SID COCHRAN JR., 805 Citizens' First National Bank Building, Tyler, Texas 75701: Relative to "sportsmanlike conduct", I had not suggested that such standards of conduct necessarily entered into the play of Diplomacy. Rather, I would suggest that such standards are applicable to the scoring of the game. So far as I have been able to observe from lightly conning GRAUSTARK and Brobdingnag, it would appear that categories are ob-

served: apples, lemons, and pears are not added to obtain a total "Pieces of fruit". Moreover, the scores of two-party games are not kept in the same way as are those of five-man or seven-man games, but the latter groups have greater or fewer points accorded to the players according to their ability to resist annihilation. I further note that your own magazine allows that numbers were assigned to various purported games as hoaxes. I now define game 1964G as a successful hoax perpetrated by yourself with the aid of the gamesmaster.

((No, neither Gamesmaster knew anything about the hoax.))

Now then as to your discussion with Turner on the support of warfare/cheating at Diplomacy/cards/chess: I fail to see where the epithet 'supporter of war' has anything to do with the latter. One either cheats in these matters or not - although, as pointed out in the "Tamerlane's Great Chess" article in STRUBECK, it helps if you are also the permanently sitting commission on revision of the rules, and Lord of Ten Thousand Spears. Then, at the safe distance of some hektoyears and thousands of kilometers, we can smile and call it "fudging".

Evidently, you are one of those who condemn all wars and any wars whatsoever (unless it be the Jewish-Arabic struggle(?) - and if that one is on your approved list, on either side - why? ((The Arab soldiers who were trapped between their rulers' lies and the Jews' guns have aroused laughter or contempt from the callous, and pity from the rest. But were they in any different case from the American troops in Vietnam?)) But if such is the case, why do you expend valuable time, energy, and typewriter paper on chess, diplomacy, and the like? Isn't this a form of combat in itself? Doesn't the play of such games bit by bit accustom the tender green mind to the thought of combat and develop a citizen mentality that will the more readily assent to warfare, even if only the Watts-Detroit-Bedford-Stuyvesant type of warfare? By lending your prestige to these pastimes, Herr Doktor, do you not au fond support war by your conduct while denouncing it with your mouth?

((I can tell the difference between the symbol and the reality - a distinction which apparently escapes most professional warmakers. See the editorial in GRAUSTARK #147 for further comments on these lines.))

To be sure, you insist that you have not killed anyone - lately. As a newcomer to your arguments, I concede this. But is there not such a thing in your code as justifiable homicide or excusable homicide? I should appreciate the pertinent extracts from Boardman's Annotated Graustarkian Penal Code, if time permits.

((How about this one: "Should the party of the first part incite the party of the second part to kill the party of the third part, it shall be deemed excusable homicide if the party of the second part instead kills the party of the first part." I'm not definitely adding this yet to the aforesaid penal code - just putting it forth for a suggestion. I do not profess as yet to have a completely worked out ethical code for this situation. Stopping war is the first order of business; the ethical code can come later, as ethical codes always have, to justify the actions already taken.))

MARGARET GEMIGNANI, 4541 North Ocean Drive, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Florida 33303 ((Please note correction of the address given in the last issue of GRAUSTARK)): No, your Feast of the Wheel distressed none. It was well written and enjoyable. Oh, Oh, O O (correction due to a stress on better spellings) Hate. Now that is what Capt Walker and many other fans don't want in Diplomacy zine. If you want to put it in your "political or opinion" zines, that is your business. We don't have to read it.

Yes, I like satire. Svetsora is not offensive. It does not bit like O O Hate.

Congratulations! You printed my letter without too many insults and almost correct. And you said I can't spell.

((I do my best to preserve the unique Gemignani flavor in these letters. This involves taking great care to preserve your mis-spellings, and not to let any of my own misprints enter. But readers are assured that the spelling "speel" is your own.))

You better inform several of gamesmasters, you don't send in rating. Your name is on their lists, I think John McCallum has your name on his list. Maybe it was a case of mistaken identity. Sorry if I accused you of doing some-thing you didn't.

You are quite "honored". Quite a few places have black listed you. But Uncle Ho still loves you.

You are entitle to your opinion but not to pushing it down others' throats. Respect

their freedom of speak and they will respect yours. But you are making an effect to slow down. We appreciate it.

Shame on you talking about Chinese and Russian guns. You told me quite clearly that China "never (well, almost never) interferes in little nations' trouble and Russia wouldn't do a thing like that! would they?

Did you hear that V C are waging a war on poverty? they are killing off all the poor people and sending their own dipandants to camps where they will be taking care of properly.

You call Him the Prince of War, I don't.

Happy Better New Year and spread a little Christmas around. It helps.

P. S. What do I get a replacement spot? You promised me other spot but it never materialized.

ROD WALKER, 1611 Lowry Drive, Rantoul, Ill. 61866: As to Conrad's "survey" ((see Conrad von Metzke's letter, GRAUSTARK #157)) even he pointed out the relative worthlessness of his sampling technique. The opinions he gathered represented the people he talked to, and nobody else. No generalized conclusions whatever may be drawn from his material. My discussions with people returned from Vietnam of course cannot be adduced in favor of any general conclusions - except that none of them who favors the war (is a "hawk") is a bloodthirsty monster. However, it is my impression that those who have fought there are generally critical of the anti-war demonstrators and unsympathetic with their aims and goals. This is because they view the demonstrators as members of the more irresponsible elements of our society (and many are), they believe the demonstrations do help the morale of the enemy, and because they believe that the demonstrators thoroughly downgrade the effort and sacrifice our military personnel have made in Vietnam. The people I have talked to generally feel that we have put so much into this that we should see it through to some sort of honorable conclusion. Naturally, opinions run a wide gamut on such subjects as, e. g., whether we should have gone into Vietnam in the first place, Johnson's conduct of the war, invasion of North Vietnam, treatment of demonstrators, and so on. Most are ready to admit the right to demonstrate, but express extreme disapproval of the way in which most demonstrations are handled.

My, you are reaching, aren't you? The fact that the AP says Johnson "takes solace" in the outcome of the abortive Communist rebellion in Indonesia is taken by you as ipso facto evidence that (a) Johnson does feel that way and (b) he "takes solace" in the large-scale killing rather than in the political implications of the event (which is how I, and any reasonable person, would read the story). Just so you know, I "take solace" in the thing, too. It is the most encouraging event in the long and sordid history of China's subversion of her neighbors since the defeat of the Communist terrorists of Malaya and the Philippines.

The massacres which attended the recent political upheavals in Indonesia are typical of that relatively primitive country, so once the Communist attempted revolution began, it was only a question of the identity of the victims. The leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party and their masters in Peking should have thought of that before they tried to overthrow the Jakarta government. ((Which, according to your opinion in an earlier letter, they already controlled through their ~~fake~~ puppet Sukarno.)) What happened after is on their heads, and I don't see why President Johnson or anybody else in this country should be concerned over events which we could not have altered or prevented. Peking's indignation is understandable - again they have failed to take over someone else's country. The price of this laudable setback to Chinese imperial ambitions was, as you pointed out, a large number of lives, many of them presumably innocent. However, if China had not been meddling in Indonesian affairs to begin with, that price would not have had to be paid. If President Johnson is intelligent enough to realize that we have won a great victory in Indonesia without so much as lifting a finger, then that is to his credit.

((According to Maynard Parker in Newsweek, on the Indonesia sector of Kalimantan (Borneo) a drive against Maoist guerrillas has turned into "open season against all Chinese". Thousands have been slaughtered. About 50,000 are in refugee camps. So this "anti-Communist" revolution has resulted in giving the Chinese of Indonesia the same status as the Jews of Nazi Germany. The parallels are frightening. In each case, the alleged existence of a Jewish/Chinese conspiracy to take over Germany/Indonesia has been made the excuse for imprisoning or killing the Jews/Chinese of that country. The

butchery is excused on the grounds that, had the foreign conspirators not started it all, the innocent would not have suffered with the guilty.))

Again, John, I ask that if you must go about slandering the President in the senseless and baseless way you have been doing of late, please separate the stuff from GRAUSTARK and make it an enclosure or something. That way, those of your readers who want it can take it, and those of us who would rather not bother can get just the Diplomacy part. I think this is a reasonable proposal. Your argument that this kind of mixture exists in science-fiction fandom does not mean I have to put up with it in Dippy circles - I would not subscribe to any s-f 'zine with that kind of material in it, either. I am only a reader letting you, as an editor, know that I am dissatisfied with your editorial policy. If you choose not to change it, that is your business; if I choose not to receive the result in the mail, that is mine.

Again, I point out that I would not object to a discussion of the Vietnam war on rational bases. I hope that you have not developed such a monomania about the war that you have lost sight of rationality altogether.

((This point about "extraneous" material in a Diplomacy fanzine is a fair one. It so happens that, for almost two years, my only publishing activity has been GRAUSTARK. This means that if something comes up concerning which I feel I need to comment, the only thing available is GRAUSTARK. However, now that I have resumed gazette publication with LEFTOVERS, the political commentary can go there instead. Therefore, after completing the series of three editorials on "War Games and the Game of War" in this issue, and dealing with the commentary which this may provoke, GRAUSTARK will deal more or less strictly with Diplomacy and other board games. This is not to say that it will be completely divorced from world affairs; no journal devoted to a board game which is in effect a recreation of World War I can do that. To give the Hawks equal time, for example, there will soon be a third installment of the "Directory of Unfamiliar Quotations".))

...I would also like to clarify one thing: I did not mean to include your O-O-Hate satire, since I know of no one who finds it objectionable (except maybe Reinsel), and it is in the spirit of the game, if nothing else.

((Margaret Genignani doesn't like it, as her letter in this issue decidedly shows. I don't know about Reinsel, though I did send him a sample copy of GRAUSTARK #146 lately. Could any Big Bother readers let me know whether he commented?))

...Please remember that my original objection to the inclusion of straight political material in GRAUSTARK (and this goes back to the summer of 1966) is that it is inimical to the "friendly competition" spirit of the game and results in senseless estrangements such as the one between you and Reinsel (for which you are both responsible; but that is, I think, a dead issue, and none of my business anyway.) My editorial ((in Trehwon v. II, #5)) was very snappish and nasty; it was intended to be that way, because that is exactly the way I feel about the methods too often used to protest the war. Far better is Senator McCarthy's way, which will tend to lead to rational discussion, counter-proposals, and a direct appeal to the ballot. Far from stepping on other people's toes and disrupting orderly society, he is using the means provided by our political system to their best advantage. The disruptive, violent demonstrators are no better than rabble, and deserve to be treated as common criminals - regardless of how high and lofty their aims and ideas might be.

Again, I say your opposition to war, per se, puts the cart before the horse. War is not an objective, a policy goal, or a national policy (except maybe in China) which can simply be done away with. It is a political act, designed to achieve or promote certain goals and objectives and policies or which comes about as a result of these goals, &c. You cannot do away with war until the conditions which promote it and make it possible. ((Sic.)) Further, although individuals fight wars, wars are essentially events between states; therefore, war can be eliminated only through international action. Those who believe differently are fools; the entire logic of history and all the known principles of social science argue against them. Now, by international action, I mean disarmament agreements, a world police force, and that sort of thing - without them there will always be international violence - and indications are very strong that the only realistic alternative (like it or not) to a global war of unprecedented violence is a series of smaller conflicts like Vietnam. That particular war is a frustrating one

for several reasons which I think I have already mentioned. At least in part, it is because the policy objectives are more abstruse than usual and the war does not have the glamorous aspect of a front, orthodox military movement, neat simple issues, and so on. No glamour.

((Unfortunately, your reasons for going to war are precisely the opposite of those which motivate the government. This recently became horrifyingly clear when the results of a 3-year government study on the effects of complete disarmament became known lately. From 1963 to 1966, a 15-man study group, operating under a Defense Department contract, and calling itself only "the Special Study Group", went into the political and economic consequences of just such a disarmament scheme you describe as desirable. Fortunately for the public's right to know, one of the members of the group leaked the findings, which had been kept under tight secrecy. The Special Study Group had concluded that peace would be bad for the economy and would give rise to social disruption.

((More specifically, they concluded that "although war is 'used' as an instrument of national and social policy, the fact that a society is organized for any degree of readiness for war supersedes its political and economic structure. War itself is the basic social system, within which other secondary modes of social organization conflict or conspire. It is the system which has governed most human societies of record, as it is today...It must be emphasized that the precedence of a society's war-making potential over its other characteristics is not the result of the 'threat' presumed to exist at any one time from other societies. This is the reverse of the basic situation; 'threats' against the 'national interest' are usually created or accelerated to meet the changing needs of the war system...Wars are not 'caused' by international conflicts of interest. Proper logical sequence would make it more often accurate to say that war-making societies require - and thus bring about - such conflicts. The capacity of a nation to make war expresses the greatest social power it can exercise; war-making, active or contemplated, is a matter of life and death on the greatest scale subject to social control. It should therefore hardly be surprising that the military institutions in each society claim its highest priorities."

((This callous judgment is supported by last week's slump in the stock market, which was directly attributed by observers to the rumors of peace in Vietnam. For further details see the report quoted above, which was published last fall by Dial Press under the title Report from Iron Mountain.))

*

GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is published by John Boardman, 592 16th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218. Subscriptions are 10 issues for \$1.00. Back issues are available at 10¢ each. This publication is not edited under the supervision of Bangs Leslie Tapscott.

GRAUSTARK #149

John Boardman
592 16th Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218
UL S. A.

F I R S T C L A S S M A I L

"They ought to put on every M-1 rifle: 'WARNING! Firing this gun can be hazardous to your health!'"
- Larry the Bagel Man, 30 November 1967.